

FRIDAY, MAY 26, 1897.

COMMANDER GRAMMOND, who arrived today, succeeds Commander Wyly, in the command of H. M. S. *Hemier*.

THE Hon. Treasurer of the Alice Memorial and Netherdale Hospitals begs to acknowledge with thanks the following donation to the funds of the Hospitals:—
Young Tai San \$10

MR. L. A. M. Johnston, Postmaster General at Singapore, returned to that Colony on the 21st inst. from Hongkong, where he had come to confer with our own Postmaster General and Mr. Hippiary on the Imperial Chinese Post Office and other matters.

THE Band of the West Yorkshire Regiment will play the following programme at the Officers' Mess on Sunday, the 30th:—
1—March *Millaire's Grand*
2—Overture *The Golden Cross*
3—Special Service *The Golden Cross*
4—Selection *The Golden Cross*
Wm. Geo. Bentley, A.R.C.M., Bandmaster.

TUE other day, the gunners of H.M.S. *Iphigenia* made very satisfactory shooting at practice near Singapore. Firing at a small rock from frequently altering range, and while the vessel was steaming 14 knots an hour, five hits were made, on an average, out of every six rounds.

'A Queen's Subject' writes to a Singapore contemporary suggesting that the record reign should be celebrated in the sister Colony by the erection of a Clock Tower. Here is an opportunity for a grateful act by the community of Hongkong. Why not make a gift of our Clock Tower—if Singapore is willing to carry it away!

At seven o'clock this morning, the whole of the European troops composing the garrison, with the exception of the outlying detachments, were paraded on the Garrison Parade Ground to hear sentence passed upon Sergeant Fretter, who was convicted by court martial of (1) taking a fee in respect of the sale of merchandise brought into a barrack in which the prisoner had authority, and (2) conduct to the prejudice of good order and military discipline. It was a General parade, and after Lieutenant-Colonel The O'Gorman, Deputy Adjutant-General, had read the sentence, which consisted of reduction to the rank of Corporal, Major-General Black made a short speech with reference to the incident.

Foot and mouth disease has appeared in virulent form in the Dutch Colonies.

As we understand exception has been taken to a paragraph which was reproduced in the *China Mail* some weeks ago from the *Times of Ceylon*, and as the paragraph was published in good faith, without malice, merely because of its reference to a local bank, we have much pleasure in copying the following explanation from our Ceylon contemporary:—

MR Advocate Bidoula.—We have heard nothing further of the alleged attack upon libel against this paper by Mr. Bidoula in Bangkok, but information has reached us supplying a number of details of the circumstances upon which the paragraph complained of appears to have been based. We have been assured that our original correspondent communicated the paragraph in good faith and with no vindictive motive, and there can be no question that it was published by us solely with a view to the public interest. From the time that Mr. Bidoula arrived in Ceylon, when we sided with him against the local legal authorities, who put him to considerable inconvenience in postponing the granting of his application for admission as an advocate of the Supreme Court, we have had no quarrel whatever with him. For this reason we wish spontaneously, and without prejudice, to rectify the errors in the paragraph complained of, which have been brought to our notice, and to apologise frankly for them. Mr. Bidoula did not write a libellous letter attacking the manager of the Bangkok branch of the H. & S. Bank, but wrote, concerning a case in which the bank was plaintiff, and the parties responsible will not doubt be shown in due time. The local manager of the bank asked Mr. Bidoula to withdraw this expression so far as the bank was concerned. Mr. Bidoula replied that he saw no reason for withdrawing anything. With the exception that the manager paid a visit to Hongkong, this alleged phase of the matter, and who Mr. Bidoula really referred to has not transpired. We have also to apologise for connecting the alleged libellous letter with the fact that Mr. Hunter, the bank manager, was a member of the committee which did not elect Mr. Bidoula to Cebu membership. The banker was, in fact, one of his nominators for election. Had this been known to us beforehand, we certainly should not have published the paragraph, and we now express our regret for doing so. We wish Mr. Bidoula had been the usual course of first communicating with us, either himself or through his lawyers, but that does not weigh with us in our present act of voluntarily offering him this rectification and apology.

NEW PIANO AND ORGAN Repairing Material and Machinery just to hand also the latest Music. W. Robinson & Co.

AN Imperial Ordinance (No. 114) has been issued with respect to the new gold coins. The silver ones will remain practically the same as before. The designs were published in the Japanese Official Gazette of May 13th and from them it appears that they are of a decidedly handsome appearance. New nickel 5 cent pieces are to be issued, however. Apparent size, weight, and area of the new coins as given by the Imperial Ordinance:—
80 yen gold coin, weight, 16.666 grammes.
Composition, 900 gold and 100 copper alloy.
10 yen gold coin, weight, 8.333 grammes.
Composition, 900 gold and 100 copper alloy.
5 yen gold coin, weight, 4.166 grammes.
Composition, 900 gold and 100 copper alloy.

CHINA'S FOREIGN-TRADE BOON. The most interesting fact about the statistics of China's foreign trade is that, although the country has been a long time in the hands of the foreigner, it has not been a long time in the hands of the foreigner. The statistics show that the country has been a long time in the hands of the foreigner, and that the foreigner has been a long time in the hands of the country. The statistics show that the country has been a long time in the hands of the foreigner, and that the foreigner has been a long time in the hands of the country.

REUTERS TELEGRAMS.

[Supplied to THE CHINA MAIL.]

LONDON, 26th May, 1897.

TURKEY AND THE POWERS.

The Powers have finally presented a note to the Porte regarding the terms of peace.

It is stated that the Powers, including Turkey, have agreed to appoint Prince Ferid Joseph of Battenberg Governor of Crete.

[L'Avenir du Tonkin.]

THE FRENCH PARLIAMENT.

Paris, May 19.

Parliament has been re-opened quietly. Messrs. Loubet and Brisson have expressed their regret at the Charity Bazaar fire.

INCIDENTS OF THE EUROPEAN WAR.

The Greek army has retired in good order to Mount Olympus.

Paris, May 20.

A thousand old men and women and children from Thessaly have sought refuge to the south of Lamia, where the greatest distress exists. Ten Garibaldians have been killed, and Deputy Frit and four other Italian volunteers were wounded in the battle of Domokos. Domokos was attacked by 35,000 Turks on the morning of the 17th inst. A desperate battle raged all day, and the Greeks evacuated their positions under cover of night. The Porte has ordered General Ethena to cease hostilities.

WEATHER NOTICE.

The following notice is issued from the Observatory:—

On the 26th at 11.10 a. The depression moving Eastward, has reached the N. E. part of the Sea of Japan. Pressure, however, remains in defect in the Gulf of Tongking. Gradients slight. Forecast:—Light W. or varying winds; fair.

HONGKONG PUBLIC LIBRARY.

IMPORTANT NOTIFICATION.

The following circular has been forwarded to us for publication:—

Dear Sir,—The undersigned took over the management and control of the Hongkong Public Library at the beginning of Feb., 1896, upon Dr. Cantlie's departure from the Colony, and for a time there seemed to be a prospect of the Library being carried on as a permanent institution without any change.

Applications for subscription proved, however, that the hopeful appearance of the subscription list was delusive, inasmuch as Dr. Cantlie had, by his own efforts, procured many persons to join the Library who had no intention of becoming permanent subscribers and resigned their membership after his departure from the Colony upon being applied to for subscriptions.

The list of subscribers to the Library consequently dwindled considerably, and about the close of last year it became apparent that there were only about 70 to 80 genuine annual subscribers to the Library, and at the present moment there are only about 1,134 books.

The annual subscription being only \$10 a year, 74 subscribers will only produce \$740 a year, and inasmuch as the expenses of the Library amount to \$25 a month, or \$300 a year, it is evident that the Library is in a state of financial straits.

Under the above circumstances it appears to be manifestly necessary that the subscriptions to the Library should be increased if it is to be continued as a going concern, and unless all the present members of the Library are willing to raise their subscription from \$5.00 a half year to \$7.50 a half year, it appears to be absolutely impossible that the Library should be carried on in an efficient and satisfactory condition, and it was seen to be no alternative in that case but to close the Library and sell the books, many of which are standard and valuable works, at a sacrifice.

Should all the members agree to continue to subscribe and to raise their subscription to the amount proposed, the undersigned is willing to make a present to the Library of the rent of the room from the 1st September 1896 to the 30th June 1897, in order to assist the Library to continue as a permanent institution.

If you are willing to continue to be a member of the Library and to raise your subscription from \$5.00 a half year to \$7.50 a half year, you are requested to kindly sign the agreement below and return it to the undersigned before the end of this month.—I am, dear Sir, Yours faithfully,

HENRY E. POLLOCK.

Hon. Secretary, Hongkong Public Library.

18, Bank Buildings, Hongkong, 26th May, 1897.

Stairs arriving at Batavia from Swatow, Macao, and Formosa or having touched at these ports on their voyage, will be subject to quarantine 48 hours before being allowed to disembark. The importation, also, of butter and provisions in general, unaccompanied wool and hair, skins, and furs from these places is temporarily forbidden.

CHINA'S FOREIGN-TRADE BOON. The most interesting fact about the statistics of China's foreign trade is that, although the country has been a long time in the hands of the foreigner, it has not been a long time in the hands of the foreigner. The statistics show that the country has been a long time in the hands of the foreigner, and that the foreigner has been a long time in the hands of the country.

CHINA'S FOREIGN-TRADE BOON. The most interesting fact about the statistics of China's foreign trade is that, although the country has been a long time in the hands of the foreigner, it has not been a long time in the hands of the foreigner. The statistics show that the country has been a long time in the hands of the foreigner, and that the foreigner has been a long time in the hands of the country.

CHINA'S FOREIGN-TRADE BOON. The most interesting fact about the statistics of China's foreign trade is that, although the country has been a long time in the hands of the foreigner, it has not been a long time in the hands of the foreigner. The statistics show that the country has been a long time in the hands of the foreigner, and that the foreigner has been a long time in the hands of the country.

CHINA'S FOREIGN-TRADE BOON. The most interesting fact about the statistics of China's foreign trade is that, although the country has been a long time in the hands of the foreigner, it has not been a long time in the hands of the foreigner. The statistics show that the country has been a long time in the hands of the foreigner, and that the foreigner has been a long time in the hands of the country.

CHINA'S FOREIGN-TRADE BOON. The most interesting fact about the statistics of China's foreign trade is that, although the country has been a long time in the hands of the foreigner, it has not been a long time in the hands of the foreigner. The statistics show that the country has been a long time in the hands of the foreigner, and that the foreigner has been a long time in the hands of the country.

CHINA'S FOREIGN-TRADE BOON. The most interesting fact about the statistics of China's foreign trade is that, although the country has been a long time in the hands of the foreigner, it has not been a long time in the hands of the foreigner. The statistics show that the country has been a long time in the hands of the foreigner, and that the foreigner has been a long time in the hands of the country.

CHINA'S FOREIGN-TRADE BOON. The most interesting fact about the statistics of China's foreign trade is that, although the country has been a long time in the hands of the foreigner, it has not been a long time in the hands of the foreigner. The statistics show that the country has been a long time in the hands of the foreigner, and that the foreigner has been a long time in the hands of the country.

SUPREME COURT.

IN CRIMINAL SESSIONS.

(Before His Hon. Sir John Carrington, Chief Justice.)

Friday, May 28.

ABSON.—CONVICTION AND SENTENCE.

The hearing of the charge of arson against Wong Lin Kin was resumed.

The jury were—Messrs. Chan Ho Wan, J. M. de Rozario, D. F. C. de Rosa, L. K. Ruchvalsky, Luis Ken Oles, H. McPhail and E. E. E.

Hon. W. M. Goodman, Attorney-General, instructed by Mr. H. L. Donny, Crown Solicitor, conducted the prosecution; Mr. E. Robinson, instructed by Mr. Deacon, defended the prisoner.

The Sergeant Interpreter at the Central Police Station read the statement of the prisoner when charged with the offence. He said:—I was asleep in the Accountant's room when the fire broke out. I got up when the fire was burning close to my person. My nose was suffocated by the smoke. I ran out at the door; I shouted out twice, "Run away, run away!" I ran back to my mother's place.

Mr. Robinson then addressed the jury for the defence. He said the charge was short of the most serious charge; the charge was of the extremest gravity and subject to a maximum penalty of penal servitude for life. His client was charged with setting fire to a house, thereby causing the death of persons, and if he was found guilty of that charge he was guilty of the grave charge of murder. Why should the prosecution have shrunk from the capital charge? A man's liberty could depend on his case was not got on to the evidence, and if there was not sufficient evidence to support the charge. The procedure was contrary to the English practice. If the jury stated the prisoner committed arson, they were bound to find him guilty of one of the circumstances. The jury were not all Europeans, and he did not know how much they were acquainted with forensic English—the English they had to repeat in this Court—and he trusted those who were fifteen minutes, and would remember that the law administered in that Court was British law, and that they would judge and decide by European law and principles. If the place was full of goods and tins of kerosene were found lying about, and if they were found in the house there would be strong circumstantial evidence for a case of arson. The evidence of the small quantity of goods having been sent away was therefore not sufficient to support the charge. He would not put in any witnesses. The prosecution did not do so to show that anyone had any intention of committing any crime. It was in the ordinary course of business in the absence of the proprietor by the person in charge of the premises. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there by some other person without arousing the person asleep? Why should the prisoner be suspected? He had only been a short time in the shop, about a year, and prisoner had no motive for setting fire to the shop. The defendant was not the proprietor of the shop. The evidence was circumstantial. The case of arson, but who was the culprit? Might not some other person have put the tins in the shop while the defendant was asleep? They had heard a lot about the pieces of quilt found beside the kerosene tins, and might not the pieces of quilt have been put there

Meals

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY'S
ROYAL MAIL STEAMSHIP LINE.

ROYAL MAIL STEAMSHIP LINE.

1897. 1897.

**THE FAST ROUTE BETWEEN CHINA, JAPAN AND EUROPE,
VIA CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES.**
(Calling at SHANGHAI, NAGASAKI, KOBE, YOKOHAMA AND VICTORIA, B.C.)
SAFETY—SPEED—PUNCTUALITY.
Twin Screw Steamships—5,000 Tons—10,000 Horse power—Speed 19 knots.

PROPOSED SAILINGS FROM HONGKONG.

EMPRESS OF CHINA.—Comdr. R. ARNOLD, R.N.R. ... WEDNESDAY, 9th June/97
EMPRESS OF INDIA.—Comdr. O. F. MARSHALL, R.N.R. WEDNESDAY, 30th June/97
EMPRESS OF JAPAN.—Comdr. H. FRY, R.N.R. ... WEDNESDAY, 21st July/97

THE magnificent steamships of this Line proceed through the famous INLAND SEA OF JAPAN, and usually make the voyage YOKOHAMA TO VANCOUVER (B.C.) in 12 DAYS, making close connection at Vancouver with the PACIFIC TRANS-CONTINENTAL TRAINS OF THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY, which leave daily, and cross the Continent FROM THE PACIFIC TO THE ATLANTIC WITHOUT CHANGE. Close connection is made at Montreal, Quebec, Halifax, New York and London, with the Trans-Atlantic Lines, which passengers to Great Britain and the Continent are then chartered.

Passengers booked through to all principal points and AROUND THE WORLD. Return tickets to various points at reduced rates. Good for 4, 6, 9 and 12 months.

CIRCULAR PACIFIC TOUR TICKETS Hongkong to Vancouver, Vancouver to Sydney Australia via Honolulu, and Sydney to Hongkong via Brisbane and Torres Strait.

Straita. Good for 9 months \$100.

The attractive feature of this Company's route, embrace the **PALATIA STRATA**—the only one in the World, is the **LUXURANCE OF ITS TRANS-CONTINENTAL TRAINS** (the Company having received the highest award for same at recent Chicago World's Exhibition) and the diversity of **MAGNIFICENT MOUNTAIN AND LAKE SCENERY** through which the Railway passes.

THE DINING CARS AND MOUNTAIN HOTELS of this route are owned and operated by the Company, and the accompaniments and Guides are second to none.

For further information, Maps, Guide Books, Rates of Passage, etc., apply to

D. E. BROWN, General Agent,
PEDDER STREET. 102

Hongkong, May 24, 1897.

C. P. R. SUMMER TRIPS.

SPECIAL ROUND TRIP RATES TO JAPAN, VANCOUVER, AND BANFF.

Commencing 1st May, and continuing through the Summer, Return Tickets can be purchased to Banff, including Berth in Sleeping Car and Meals on the Railway, journey from Vancouver to the terminus of \$50. The Ports of Call are HAGATA, NAGASAKI, KUBE, YOKOHAMA, VICTORIA, B.C., and VANCOUVER, and permission is granted to STOP-OVER at any Port and continue the subsequent Steamers. Every facility is offered for breaking the journey at any intermediate place in British Columbia to make excursions into the Rocky Mountains.

BANFF.—This popular resort, charmingly situated among the Peaks and Glaciers of the Canadian Rockies, is one of the most beautiful and well equipped for the

natural Hot Sulphur and Mineral Springs, magnificent scenery, and clear, invigorating air. The large and well-appointed Hotel stands 4,500 feet above sea level, providing

its guests with all modern comforts and luxuries, also a steam-launch, rowing boats and canoes for making excursions on the river and numerous lakes in the vicinity, where excellent fishing and shooting is obtainable.

Mails.	Mails.
--------	--------

<p align="center">NOTICE</p> <p align="center">COMPAGNIE DES MESSAGERIES MARITIMES.</p> <p align="center">PAQUEBOTS POSTE FRANCAIS.</p> <p align="center">STEAM FOR</p> <p align="center">SAIGON, SINGAPORE, BATAVIA, COLOMBO, BOMBAY, ADEN, EGYPT, MARSEILLES, MEDITERRANEAN AND BLACK SEA PORTS, LONDON, HAVRE AND BORDEAUX:</p> <p align="center">ALSO</p> <p align="center">PORTS OF BRAZIL & RIVER PLATE.</p>	<p align="center">NORDDEUTSCHER LLOYD.</p> <p align="center">NOTICE.</p> <p align="center">—</p> <p align="center">STEAM FOR</p> <p align="center">SINGAPORE, COLOMBO, ADEN, SUZ, PORT SAID, NAPLES, GENOA, ANTWERP, BREMEN & HAMBUR PORTS OF THE LEVANT, BLACK SEA & RAILING PORTS:</p> <p align="center">ALSO,</p> <p align="center">LONDON, NEW YORK, BOSTON, BALTIMORE, NEW ORLEANS,</p>
---	---

ON SUNDAY, the 30th May, early in the
 GALVESTON & SOUTH AMERICA
 PORTS

YARRA, Captain LE COMPTON, with
MAILS, PASSENGERS, SPECIE, and
CARGO, will leave this Port for MAR-
SEILLES via BOMBAY.
This Steamer connects at COLOMBO
with the s.s. Polynezie, which vessel

THE COMPANY'S STEAMERS WILL CALL
AT SOUTHAMPTON TO LAND PASSENGERS
AND LUGGAGE.

N.B.—Cargo can be taken on through B.

Cargo and Specie will be registered for London as well as for Marseilles, and accepted in transit through Marseilles for the principal places of Europe.

Shipping Orders will be granted till Noon.

Cargo will be received on board until 4 a.m., Specie and Parcels until 3 p.m. on the 29th May. (Parcels are not to be sent on board; they must be left at the Company's Office).


Contents and value of Packages are required.

For further particulars, apply at the Company's Office.

G. DE CHAMPEAUX,
Agent.

Hongkong, May 23, 1897. 1060

with MAILS, PASSENGERS, SPEC. and CARGO — will leave this port as above.



Shipping Orders will be granted Noon, on SATURDAY, the 19th June. Cargo and Specie will be received board until 5 p.m., on MONDAY, the 20th June, and Parcels will be received

STEAM FOR
STRAITS CEYLON AUSTRALIA.

INDIA, ADEN, EGYPT,
MEDITERRANEAN PORTS,
PLYMOUTH AND LONDON.
Through Bills of Lading issued for BATA-
VIA, PERMANENTLY CONTIN-

ENTAL AND AMERICAN PORTS.

THE Steamship ROHILLA, Captain
F. COLE, carrying Her Majesty's
Mails, will be despatched from this for
BOMBAY, on THURSDAY, the 3rd
Inst, at Noon, taking Passengers and

Cargo for the above Ports.

(This Steamer connects at Bombay with
 the Steamship *INDIA*, leaving that Port
 on the 25th June, for LONDON direct).
 Silk and Valuables, all Cargo for France,
 and Tea for London (under arrangement).

they appear in the Daily issue.

London; other cargo for London, &c., will be conveyed via Bombay.

Parcels will be received at this Office until 4 p.m. on the day before sailing. The amounts and value of all packages are

required.

The *Overland China Mail* will be regular
 posted from the *China Mail Office* to
 London, or their addresses being forwarded
 to the Office.

Subscription:
 For Annual, £1500, postage, 10/-

P. & O. B. N. Co.'s Office.	" Quarterly, . . .	1.00
	" Single Copy,	0.30

14-00000

